

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ST. PAUL MERCURY INSURANCE ) Case No.: 12-CV-05952-LHK  
COMPANY, a Minnesota corporation, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, ) ORDER CONTINUING HEARING  
v. )  
 )  
AMERICAN SAFETY INDEMNITY )  
COMPANY, an Oklahoma corporation; )  
CENTURY SURETY COMPANY, an Ohio )  
corporation; CHARTIS SPECIALTY )  
INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois )  
corporation; CLARENDON AMERICA )  
INSURANCE COMPANY, a New Jersey )  
corporation; FIRST MERCURY INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, an Illinois corporation; GEMINI )  
INSURANCE COMPANY, a Delaware )  
corporation; GRANITE STATE INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; )  
GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, an Ohio corporation; HARTFORD )  
CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, an )  
Indiana corporation; INTERSTATE FIRE & )  
CASUALTY COMPANY, an Illinois )  
corporation; IRONSHORE SPECIALTY )  
INSURANCE COMPANY, an Arizona )  
corporation; LEXINGTON INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, a Delaware corporation; )  
NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; )  
NATIONAL FIRST & MARINES )  
INSURANCE COMPANY, a Nebraska )  
corporation; NAVIGATORS INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, a New York corporation; NIC )

1 INSURANCE COMPANY, a New York )  
 2 corporation; NOTH AMERICAN CAPACITY )  
 3 INSURANCE COMPANY, a New Hampshire )  
 4 corporation; OLD REPUBLIC INSURANCE )  
 5 COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; )  
 6 PRAETORIAN INSURANCE COMPANY, a )  
 7 Pennsylvania corporation; ROCKHILL )  
 8 INSURANCE COMPANY, an Arizona )  
 9 corporation; VALLEY FORGE INSURANCE )  
 10 COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; )  
 11 VIRGINIA SURETY COMPANY, an Illinois )  
 12 corporation; and Does 1-10, inclusive, )  
 13 )  
 14 )  
 15 )  
 16 )  
 17 )  
 18 )  
 19 )  
 20 )  
 21 )  
 22 )  
 23 )  
 24 )  
 25 )  
 26 )  
 27 )  
 28 )  
 Defendants.

On November 21, 2012, St. Paul Mercury Insurance Company ("Plaintiff") filed the instant insurance action against twenty-two defendants. ECF No. 1. Since that time, the parties have filed no less than ten stipulations to extend time for Defendants to file responses to the Complaint. *See* ECF Nos. 7, 9, 11, 21, 32, 33, 31, 42, 44, and 53.

On February 19, 2013, Plaintiff filed an Ex Parte Application to Continue the Case Management Conference Set for February 27, 2013. ECF No. 57. In this Application, Plaintiff states that, as of February 6, 2013, only six attorneys representing ten of the named defendants had answered or advised of their representation. *Id.* at 4. Plaintiffs further advise that, "[s]ince that time, counsel for all but two of the remaining defendants have advised of their representation or that representation is forthcoming." *Id.* Plaintiff now requests a continuance of the case management conference by four weeks "so that all named defendants may enter their appearances and the parties can conduct a further Rule 26(f) conference and allow for a productive Case Management Conference." *Id.*

In light of the foregoing, the Court finds good cause to GRANT Plaintiff's ex parte request to continue the case management conference from February 27, 2013, to April 3, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. However, any further requests for extensions will be disfavored.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 20, 2013

  
 LUCY H. KOH  
 United States District Judge